

**REMARKS**

Claims 12, and 4-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 9 is amended, and claims 10-17 are added. The amendments and added claims introduce no new matter. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2 and 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0152904 to Doty. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Doty is alleged to teach the features of the independent claims with the exception of a storing unit configured to store notational data. The Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Doty to include such features in order to synchronize the notational data with the course data and, thus, to provide streaming videos synchronized with user interactive applications to enhance the total educational experience for a student/learner user. The analysis of the Office Action fails for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, a storing unit configured to store notational data, which the user has entered into the browsing client in accordance with the slide data displayed on the screen, in association with the user and the slide data, the distribution server provides the notational data to the browsing client in accordance with a request from the browsing client of a user. Claims 4-9 recite similar features. The Office Action improperly paraphrases these features in first asserting that Doty teaches the more general feature of the browsing client is configured to allow a user to enter notes during the time the material is being presented. As argued previously, the feature of creating notes, which can be reviewed in total, cannot reasonably be considered to correspond the above features, that deal with notes relating to one slide stored in association with the slide.

Additionally, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case for the asserted modification of Doty. The Office Action does not provide any further reference, or teaching in the prior art, in asserting that it would have been obvious to modify Doty to associate the notes with the slide data. Further, such a modification would apparently disrupt the intent of Doty to provide review the accumulated notes at any time from the student portal. In other words, contrary to the apparent suggestion of the Office Action, the notes in Doty are not intended as an enhancement of the presentation. Rather, the notes function in Doty allows a user to easily create a comprehensive notes file.

Further, the above-described features would not have been obvious in view of Doty at least because, as described in Applicants' specification, these features provide unanticipated benefits. By storing the notational data in association with the slide data, for example, each note content can be displayed together with the corresponding slide thumbnail as shown in Fig. 8 (see page 23, lines 18-20 of Applicants' disclosure, as filed). Thereby, a user can easily find a note relating to a specific slide. Doty does not suggest this benefit. Accordingly, the features of independent claims 1 and 4-9 cannot reasonably be considered to have been obvious over Doty.

For at least the above reasons, the applied reference cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of features positively recited in independent claims 1 and 4-9. Additionally, claim 2 also would not have been reasonably suggested by the applied reference for at least the dependence of this claim on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that this claim recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4-9 are respectfully requested.

Added claims 10-17 are likewise allowable at least for the respective dependence of these claims, directly or indirectly, on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately

patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites. For example, claim 10 recites, among other features, wherein the distribution server is configured to retain and manage questions, entered to the browsing client by the browser user, with a Q flag; the distribution server is configured to retain and manage answers to a question of another user, entered to the browsing client by the respective browser user, with an A flag; and the retained questions and answers are associated with respective slide data. Claim 14 recites similar features. Support for the amended features can be found, for example, on page 16, lines 2-25, and Fig. 2, element 71, of Applicants' disclosure, as filed. Doty cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested such features at least because, for example, the real-time testing of Doty is synchronized with the video presentation, and questions are not entered by browser users, or associated with Q and A flags (see paragraph [0115] of Doty).

Claim 11 recites, among other features, wherein a content of the stored notational data is displayed for each associated slide. Claim 15 recites similar features. Support for the amended features can be found, for example, on page 23, lines 18-23, and Fig. 8, of Applicants' disclosure, as filed. Doty cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested such features at least because, for example, as discussed above, Doty does not store notational data.

Claim 12 recites, among other features, wherein when a first slide data displayed by the browsing client is switched to a second slide data, a displayed first notational data associated with the first slide data is changed to a displayed second notational data associated with the second slide data. Claim 16 recites similar features. Support for the amended features can be found, for example, on page 22, lines 16-17, and Fig. 6, element 99, of Applicants' disclosure, as filed. Doty cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested such features at least because, for example, as discussed above, Doty does not store, display, and switch notational data associated with slide data.

Claim 13 recites, among other features, means for receiving a user input from the browsing client that instructs the display of the video data to resume from a time position up to which the user has previously browsed the video data. Claim 17 recites similar features. Support for the amended features can be found, for example, on page 20, lines 22-25, and Fig. 5, element 91, of Applicants' disclosure, as filed.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 2 and 4-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

James E. Golladay, II  
Registration No. 58,182

JAO:JEG/clf

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: December 31, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

|  |
|--|
| <b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b><br>Please grant any extension necessary for entry;<br>Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461 |
|--|